UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,294	02/05/2004	Masaru Izawa	12014-0010DV	3231
22902 CLARK & BRO	7590 03/23/201 ODY	EXAMINER		
1700 Diagonal	Road, Suite 510	ZHENG, LOIS L		
Alexandria, VA	A 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/771,294	IZAWA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LOIS ZHENG	1793		

	LOIS ZHENG	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the complexity. 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	,, ,	3 1 7 3	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>8-11,24 and 25</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Roy King/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's argument regarding the amended ratio of total acid to free acid of 6 to 11 is not convincing because Boulos teaches a total acid range of 4 to 50(col. 6 lines 13-19) and a free acid range of -1.5 to 1.5(col. 6 lines 29-34). Therefore, the ratio of total acid to free acid in the coating solution of Boulos could range from 2.67(i.e. 4/1.5) to 33.33(i.e. 50/1.5), which encompasses the claimed total to free acid ratio range of 6 to 11. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness exists. See MPEP 2144.05. The examiner maintains that the rejection is proper absent applicant's persuasive evidence demonstrating the criticality of claimed total to free acid ratio of 6 to 11. In addition, the instant invention do not claim free acid number, only recites total acid number and ratio of total acid to free acid.

Applicant further argues that Buolos does not realize the importance of the presence of potassium ions in a Cr containing steel surface treatment(i.e. to improve resistance to galling). The examiner does not find applicant's argument persuasive because it is well settled that prima facie obviousness is not rebutted by merely recognizing additional advantages present in the prior art. See MPEP 2145. In this case applicant's recognition of additional advantage due to the presence of potassium ion, such as to improve resistance to galling, does not render the instant invention non-obvious since Boulos teaches the presence of potassium to control the acidity of the treatment solution. The presence of potassium ions in the treatment solution of Boulos would have inherenly improved resistance to galling.

Applicant further argues that Boulos only shows using sodium hydroxide in its examples, not potassium hydroxide. The examiner does not find applicant's argument convincing because the examples are merely embodiments of Boulos and do not limit the scope of Boulos' invention, which also includes the addition of potassium hydroxide.